

M. Carlier Francois
155 rue de Saint Andre, #206
59800 Lille
FRANCE

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

8/6/97

Dear M. Francois,

I am 84 now and have been lucky in surviving a rather large number of serious illnesses that are ~~not~~ uncommonly fatal. However, they ^udo leave me feeble and I [^]can no longer work the hours of past years. So I do not take the time that years ago I would have taken to respond to your letter. And in being blunt, which you may or may not realize is in your interest, I may offend. That is not my purpose. I'd not take any time for that.

You say that for 10 years you have been studying the JFK assassination thoroughly. From your letter you have buried yourself largely in the lunatic fringe of it. When you refer to JFK Lancer as a source, for example, they are subject-matter ignoramuses who while nice people run a business. Their editor is rabid. Years ago he sought a paper on me as a CIA agent when I'd sued the government more than a dozen times, including the CIA and the FBI, had obtained and made publicly available about a third of a million pages, ~~has~~ established some principles of law in the course of this and, in fact, was in part responsible for the 1974 amending of the Freedom of Information ^{Act} ~~Act~~ that made CIA and similar records accessible under it. The guy is an egomaniacal nut and has done little real research or work of any kind. He also indulges his likes and dislikes in what they publish. There are more examples but this should be enough.

Pretty much the same is true of COPA. Although some of those people are very fine people and some have a decent knowledge of some areas of the case, they regularly do nutty things, say them, publish them, and do no better.

You put all this silliness and worse in a book and you will be deceiving and misleading your readers. As virtually all that is published here does.

There is only one way of addressing the assassination responsibly. That is by mastering the official evidence that has been disclosed. It proves the whole official story more than false- as impossible. But doing that takes much time and work and those who cast themselves in the Sherlock Holmes role will not do that work, go to that expense. They are happier making nonsensical theories up and seeking to validate them by more nonsense and abysmal factual ignorance.

The assassination of any president is a de facto coup d'etat. In writing about any such crime, the most subversive under our system, the writer who would be responsible owes his reader and his country total factuality from only solid and dependable sources. Not theories that can't survive close examination.

Good luck and best wishes, sincerely, Harold Weisberg

